



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,543	12/19/2005	Katsuhiko Kyuken	0951-0177PUS1	9378
2252	7590	06/20/2011		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747			MORRISON, THOMAS A	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/20/2011	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/561,543	KYUKEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> THOMAS MORRISON	<b>Art Unit</b> 3653	

**All Participants:****Status of Application:** Allowed

(1) THOMAS MORRISON. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (2) Robert Downs (Reg. No. 48,222). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8 June 2011**Time:** 3pm**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*None*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Stefano Karmis/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3653

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Contacted applicant's representative (Mr. Downs) to discuss how to resolve the title of the invention issue outlined in applicant's letter filed on 5/5/2011 in this case. During the telephone conversation, the examiner explained different options for changing the title of the invention by amendment. After explaining the different options with applicant's representative, applicant's representative indicated that there is no need or interest in changing the title of the invention by amendment. Since there is no interest in changing the title of the invention at this time, there is no further action needed in this case. This case is believed to be in condition for allowance.